UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

APRIL 12, 2023.

On Review from the United States EPA in Case No. 23-1061 and No. 11-1184

Opening Statement for Petitioners

Sidney T. LEWIS and Yvonne D. LEWIS, Sierra Club, Petitioners / Relators

Vs.

Michael Regan, Admin. of the UNITED STATES Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] Defendant-Respondent.

Vs.

Michael Thrift Counsel for Sovereign of the UNITED STATES EPA, Ex. Relators.

STATE OF ILLINOIS, Plaintiffs and Intervening Plaintiffs Sidney T. LEWIS as Indispensable Parties in "Argyle Park", Plaintiff- Relators

Anne M. GORSUCH, et al., Defendant and Intervening Respondent; UNITED STATES Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]

Sidney T. LEWIS as Indispensable Parties in "Argyle Park", Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]

Case No. 23-1061; Case No. 22-5315; No.11-1184; Case No. 81-2295; Case No. 81-2025; Case No. 81-2214 Consolidated; Case No. 12-cv-361; Case No. 12-cv-363; Case No. 19-cv-1660 Related; Case No. 78-1689; Case No. 78-1715; Case No. 78-1734 and No. 78-1899 Related;

No. 81-2025; No. 82-1346; No. 11-1184; No. 12-1254; Nos. 12-1146, 12-1248, 12-1254, 12-1268, 12–1269, 12–1272; No. 15-496, No. 15-499, No. 21-3093 (2nd. Cir., SDNY); No. 23-1061; No. 22-5315; No. 23-1061; No. 81-2214; No. 81-2295;

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
STATEMENT REGARDING ORAL ARGUMENTSTABLE OF CONTENTSTABLE OF AUTHORITIES	
"The Administrative Procedure Act ("APA") requires an agency to provide advance public notice and opportunity for comment when it engages in substantive rulemaking. 5 U.S.C. §§ 553(b), (c) (1976). This requirement permits interested parties to criticize the proposed agency action, and allows the agency to benefit from outside suggestions. See National Tour Brokers Association v. United States, 591 F.2d 896, 902 (D.C.Cir.1978). The suspension or delayed implementation of a final regulation normally constitutes substantive rulemaking under APA § 553. See, e.g., Environmental Defense Fund v. Gorsuch, 713 F.2d 802 at 816 (D.C.Cir.1983); NRDC v. EPA, 683 F.2d 752, 761 (3d Cir.1982); Council of Southern Mountains, Inc. v. Donovan, 653 F.2d 573, 580 n. 28 (D.C.Cir.1981) (per curiam)."	
(EXPLAINED BY: Env't Def. Fund, Inc. v. E.P.A., 716 F.2d 915, pp.920 (D.C.	
It follows that the petitioners-Lewis herein are "indispensable parties" under $3 \le 553(b)$ (see 716 F.2d 915, pp.920; 713 F.2d 802 at 816).	Fitle V (5 U.S.C.
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES ON INTERIM REVIEWSTATEMENT OF THE ISSUES ON POST APPEAL	
Statutory thresholds of PM10 and PM2.5 as radically expanded in PSD and Title V programs, making them both <u>unadministrable</u> and " <u>unrecognizable</u>)	
STATEMENT OF THE HAZARDOUS WASTE DUMPING CASE	
1. STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BACKGROUND	
a. The Clean Air Act	

Filed: 04/13/2023

(iv). The PM10-2.5 Reg. [88 FR 14920, March 10, 2023 Double Standard]...

"Plaintiff approximates an 18-month long review period by adding together what it considers to be analogous sections of the Act: section 108(a)(2) of the Act gives the EPA one year to issue criteria for newly adopted pollutants; section 109(a) of the 1977 Act gave the Agency 120 days to adopt the original NAAQS; and 60 days are allowed for advance notice in citizen suits under section 304 of the Act...

Relevant to NAAQS revisions are certain key epidemiological studies which suggest that there is a statistical correlation between particulate pollution levels below the current NAAQS and injury to human health and welfare. Further, there is controversy regarding whether the reported health effects are caused by "course or fine" particles. The EPA contends that tightening or relaxing PM standards may or may not be appropriate..."

b. RCRA

(EXPLAINED BY: American Lung Assn v. Browner, 884 F. Supp. 345, pp.347, notes at 4 & 5 course v. fine PM10-2.5)

(i). The Lan Ban Regulations	
"The fact that RCRA like other remedial statutes which focus on damage to the environment is a strict liability statute , and the fact that it also has criminal provisions not at issue here, reflects the gravity of the situation and the depth of congressional concern. Accordingly, it is hard to say that the Government, acting in its sovereign capacity, can ever [completely] bargain away its duty to enforce the laws enacted by Congress for the protection of all."	
EXPLAINED BY: United States v. Allegan Metal Finishing Co., 696 F. Supp. 27:	5,pp.295)
c. The Administrative Procedures Act	9
2. The Proceeding Below	11
ARGUMENT	′,
ARGUMENT SUMMARY	

Filed: 04/13/2023

"EPA then announced steps it was taking to "tailor" the PSD program and Title V to greenhouse gases. 75 Fed.Reg. 31514 (hereinafter Tailoring Rule). Those steps were necessary, it said, because the PSD program and Title V were designed to regulate "a relatively small number of large industrial sources," and requiring permits for all sources with greenhouse-gas emissions above the statutory thresholds would radically expand those programs, making them both <u>unadministrable</u> and "<u>unrecognizable</u> to the Congress that designed" them. *Id.*, at 31555, 31562."

(EXPLAINED BY: Util. Air Regulatory Grp. (UARG) v. E.P.A., 134 S. Ct. 2427, pp.2437, 189 L. Ed. 2d 372 (U.S. 2014)); ALSO SEE: EXHIBIT A, at pg. 4, Vol. 75 Fed.Reg. 31555 (June 3, 2010)("unrecognizable to the Congress"))

CERTIFIC	CATE OI	F THE S	ERVIC:	E		 	 • • • • • • •	
CONCLU	SION				• • • • • • •	 	 • • • • • • •	• • •
. 6								

Hernandes and Regan, 10st "interim status",

42 u.s. c 6925 (e) (2), in Connection with

their Non-compliance with strict liability

according to Authority in 696 Fisupp. 275,

Pp. 295.

Regar's march 10, 2023 "Air Quality Redesignation" at Exhibit A, 88 FR 14920-14925 is Statutorily barred 42 usc 6925 (e)(2).

June D. Lenis 4-12-23

4075

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I kereby certify that I have served the foregoing

on Respondents by sending a copy via First

Class Mail to each of the following addresses on this the 12th of April, 2023.

Michael Regan Administrator U.S. Environmental Protection Agency EPA Headquarters 1101A Ariel Rios Building 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20460

Environmental Protection Agency 1101A EPA Headquarters Ariel Rios Building 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20460

APRILY 12, 2023

Merrick Garland Attorney General U.S. Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530-0001

michael Thrift Legal Counsel For Environmental Protection Agency 1200 Pennsylvania Ave, N. W. Washington, D.C. 20460

Bave Yost, Ohio Atty, GEM Rhodes State office Tower 30 E. Broad Street Columbus, OH 43215

J Louis youme D. Lovie 4-12-23

CERTIFICATE OF PARTIES

I hereby certify that I have served the foregoing fetition For Review

Rule 2B;

Respondents by sending a copy via First

Class Mail to each of the following addresses on this the 9th of April, 2023.

Michael Regan Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EPA Headquarters 1101A
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460

Environmental Protection Agency 1101A EPA Headquarters Ariel Rios Building 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20460

DATED: April 9, 2023

Merrick Garland
Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Michael Thrift
Legal Counsel For
Environmental Protection Agency
1200 fennsylvania Ave., N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Bave Yost, Chie Atty, Gen Rhodes State office Tower 30 E. Broad Street Columbus, OH 43215

Sidney Lewis your D. Lowie 4-12-23

FOR THE D.C. CIRCUIT

2023 APR 12 PM 10: 44

USCA Case #23- UNITED STATES GOURT OF APREA 45 3/2023 Page 7 of 7

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

333 Constitution Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001-2866 Phone: 202-216-7000 | Facsimile: 202-219-8530 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

MAR 1 0 2023

RECEIVED

	AGENCY DOCKETING STATEMENT Administrative Agency Review Proceedings (To be completed by appellant/petitioner)		
1. (CASE NO. 23-1061 2. DATE DOCKETED: Hear-107		
3. (CASE NAME (lead parties only)		
4. T	TYPE OF CASE: Review Appeal Enforcement Complaint Tax Court		
5. K	S THIS CASE REQUIRED BY STATUTE TO BE EXPEDITED? (Yes (No f YES, cite statute		
6. C a.	CASE INFORMATION: Identify agency whose order is to be reviewed:		
b.	Give agency docket or order number(s):		-
c.	Give date(s) of order(s):		
	Has a request for rehearing or reconsideration been filed at the agency? C Yes C No If so, when was it filled? By whom?		
	Has the agency acted? C Yes C No If so, when?		
e.	Identify the basis of appellant's/petitioner's claim of standing. <u>See</u> D.C. Cir. Rule 15(c)(2):		
g. <i>i</i>	Are any other cases involving the same underlying agency order pending in this Court or any Carlo Yes Carlo No If YES, identify case name(s), docket number(s), and court(s) Are any other cases, to counsel's knowledge, pending before the agency, this Court, another Court, or the Supreme Court which involve substantially the same issues as the instant case	er Circu	 uit
	Yes No If YES, give case name(s) and number(s) of these cases and identify court/a		
	Have the parties attempted to resolve the issues in this case through arbitration, mediation, alternative for dispute resolution? C Yes C No If YES, provide program name and participation.		
_		cootses	_B=
_			
Sian	ature Loling Thomas Jewis Date March 10, 2023	And a second	R Top
	e of Counsel for Appellant/Petitioner	.f=	
Addr	•	an Desira	
E-Ma	ail Phone () Fax ()		
No	ATTACH A CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE ote: If counsel for any other party believes that the information submitted is inaccurate or incomplete, counsely	el may·s	30

advise the Clerk within 7 calendar days by letter, with copies to all other parties, specifically referring to the

USCA Form 41 August 2009 (REVISED)

challenged statement.